

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed March 6, 2009. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-13 and 15-18 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 9, and 15 being the independent claims. Claims 5, 8, 9, and 15 have been amended, and Claims 14 and 19 have been canceled. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although the Applicants disagree with the rejection, claims 5 and 8 have been amended in the interest of expediting prosecution. Claim 5 has been amended to now recite, *inter alia*, installing a force sensor on each strut, the force sensors capable of creating force signals representative of the forces applied through the struts to the spacecraft. These amendments are supported at least by column 3, lines 56-58. Claim 8 has been amended to now recites, *inter alia*, the struts including a passive isolation system serving as a mechanical low pass filter for transmitting a desired torque to the spacecraft while eliminating unwanted higher frequency vibrations. These features are supported at least by column 3, lines 45-48.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,662,178 to Rasmussen (“Rasmussen”).

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 14. Accordingly, claim 9 and claim 10, which depends from claim 9, are now allowable. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Rasmussen.

As noted above, claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 14 and should now be allowable.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 19. Accordingly, claim 15 and claim 16, which depends from claim 15, are now be allowable.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Objection to Oath

The reissue oath/declaration is objected to for allegedly being defective. Specifically, the oath/declaration allegedly does not state that the reissue is a broadening reissue or does not contain an explanation as to the nature of the broadening necessitated. New declarations signed by the inventors correcting the aforementioned defect have been filed concurrently herewith. Additionally, supplemental declarations by the inventors have been submitted stating that every error that was corrected in the present reissue declaration and that was not covered by the previous reissue declarations arose without intent to deceive the Patent Office. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 251

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 251 for allegedly being based on a defective reissue declaration. As noted above, corrected declarations have been submitted concurrently with the filing of this response. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also deemed patentable for the reasons

given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

None of the other art of record is understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: June 4, 2009

By: /CINDY H. KWACALA/
Cindy H. Kwacala
Reg. No. 47,667
(480) 385-5060